UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/675,135	09/29/2003	Michael J. Brookman	30810/39676A 5725	
	7590 08/31/200 GERSTEIN & BORU!		EXAMINER	
233 S. WACKER DRIVE, SUITE 6300			DIXON, ANNETTE FREDRICKA	
SEARS TOWER CHICAGO, IL 60606			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
,			3771	
				DEL WEDV MODE
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/31/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Amplication No.	Applicant/o					
	Application No.	Applicant(s)					
Office Action Summers	10/675,135	BROOKMAN, MICHAEL J.					
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit					
	Annette F. Dixon	3771					
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 16(a). In no event, however, may a reply be time rill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).					
Status							
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 De	ecember 2006.						
2a)⊠ This action is FINAL . 2b)☐ This	This action is FINAL . 2b) This action is non-final.						
•	☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is						
closed in accordance with the practice under E	x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45	53 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims							
4)⊠ Claim(s) 1-4 and 6-24 is/are pending in the app	olication.						
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw							
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.							
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-4 and 6-24</u> is/are rejected.	6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-4 and 6-24</u> is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.		,					
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	r election requirement.						
Application Papers							
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine	r.						
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.							
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).							
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correcti	* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *	•					
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	aminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form PTO-152.					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119							
12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:	priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a))-(d) or (f).					
 Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 							
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No							
3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior	•	ed in this National Stage					
application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the second seco	, , , ,	ad					
See the attached detailed Office action for a list of	or the certified copies not receive	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·					
Attachment(s)		,					
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)							
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application							
Paper No(s)/Mail Date	6) Other:						

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office Action is in response to the amendment filed on July 5, 2007. Examiner acknowledges claims 1-4, and 6-24 are pending in this application, with claims 1-4, 7-10, 14, 16, 18, 19, 22 having been amended, and claims 23 and 24 having been newly added.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. Claims 1-4, 6, 9, 10, 13-15, 17, 18, 20, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mucha (DE19503027) in view of Hilton et al. (EP 0 241 188 A1) and Kanwisher et al. ('098).

As to Claims 1, 9, 23, and 24, the differences between Mucha and claim 1 are a regulator means to enable delivery of said pressurized gas to a user of said apparatus and means adapted to generate a signal that is adapted to advise a wearer whether the gas emerging form said filter system has insufficient oxygen to be safely breathable and comprises at least 19.5% oxygen. Hilton et al., in a breathing apparatus, teach a regulator means (34) to enable delivery of said pressurized gas to a user of said apparatus. The purpose of regulator means (34) of Hilton et al. is to reduce the pressure

of the breathable gas leaving pressurized tank (33) so that it may be delivered to a user at a safe pressure. It would have been obvious to modify the pressurized tank of Mucha to employ a regulator means because it would have reduced the pressure of the breathable gas leaving pressurized tank so that it may be delivered to a user at a safe pressure as taught by Hilton et al. Kanwisher et al., in a breathing apparatus, teach sensor means (46) adapted to determine whether gas emerging from a filter system (14) is safely breathable and comprises at least 19.5% oxygen (col.7, lines 52-57 and lines 69-75). Kanwisher et al. also teach means (col.4, lines 42-50) associated with the sensor means adapted to generate a signal that is adapted to advise (e.g. via indicator 60) a user that gas emerging from the filter system has insufficient oxygen to be safely breathable and means (col.7, lines 69-75) to, in response to said signal, open and/or close said at least one valve (40). Kanwisher et al. teach that these elements work together for the purpose of maintaining oxygen concentration within a range of 0.4 to 0.7 atmospheres (col.4, lines 42-50). It would have been obvious to modify Mucha to include sensor means for determining the suitability of breathable air including the percentage of oxygen therein because it would have provided a means for maintaining the oxygen concentration within the breathable gas in a safe range of 0.4 to 0.7 atmospheres as taught by Kanwisher et al..

As to Claims 2 and 14, Hilton et al. (fig.7) teach plural filter media (9).

As to Claims 3 and 10, Hilton et al. (figs.4-6,8,9) teach a mask adapted to establish and maintain a seal with the face of a user so as to isolate at least the nose and mouth of said user from ambient air, and adapted to maintain a seal under

Application/Control Number: 10/675,135

Art Unit: 3771

conditions of positive pressure within the mask (note separate valves for exhalation and inhalation).

As to Claims 4, 13, 17, 18, 20 and 21, Mucha (fig.1) discloses a first conduit (6) disposed in operative relationship to and between said cylinder (9) and said mask (1), said second conduit means (5) being disposed between said filter system (7) and said mask (1), and said at least one valve (4) is adapted to control the flow of cleaned air from said filter system and/or pressurized breathable gas from said cylinder to said mask.

As to Claims 6 and 15, Hilton et al. teach a one-way exhaust valving means (4) operatively associated with the mask and operative when a user exhales whereby increasing the internal pressure in said mask above the pressure imposed by said powered forcing of ambient air through said filter system, and above the pressure imposed by gas being fed from said cylinder.

4. Claims 7, 8, 16, 19, and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mucha (DE19503027) in view of Hilton et al. (EP 0 241 188 A1) and Kanwisher et al. ('098) as applied to claim 1 and 9 above, and further in view of Bartels & Rieger (DE 3,512,644).

As to Claims 7, 8, 16, 19, and 22, the system of Mucha/Hilton/Kanwaisher et al. discloses all of the recited elements, yet does not expressly disclose a means for manually opening or closing said at least one valve by said user. However, at the time the invention was made, the use of a manual user-operated valve was known.

Specifically, Bartels & Rieger teaches manually increasing the flow of gas from a gas cylinder (11) by opening a valve (19). The purpose of providing a manually actuated valve is to provide a user with means for switching between a filtered air source and a compressed air source thereby enabling a user to conserve the compressed air source for as long as possible (see abstract). Further, one of ordinary skill would recognize that the amount of oxygen required by users differs from one person to the next; consequently, a wearer may prefer to have manual control over when and how much oxygen is dumped into the system. Therefore, it would have been obvious to further modify Mucha to include a manually operated valve that selects between the compressed air source and the filtered air source because it would have provided a user with means for switching between a filtered air source and a compressed air source thereby enabling a user to conserve the compressed air source for as long as possible as taught by Bartels & Rieger.

5. Claims 11 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mucha (DE19503027) in view of Hilton et al. (EP 0 241 188 A1) and Kanwisher et al. ('098) as applied to claim 10 above, and further in view of Hubner ('518).

As to Claims 11 and 12, the system of Mucha/Hilton/Kanwaisher et al. discloses all of the recited elements, yet does not expressly disclose a means adapted to determine if the composition of gas emerging from said filter system comprises a sufficiently small amount of particulate matter to be safely breathable. However, at the time the invention was made the use of a filter medium for filtering particulates was

known. Specifically, Hubner teaches analyzing (via sensor 7, 7a-7e) an ambient atmosphere to determine if it is not breathable and notifying the user if the ambient atmosphere is not breathable for the purpose of preventing a user from breathing toxic gases by notifying the user that the filtering capacity of the filter medium is failing as well as preventing the accumulation of potentially explosive gases. Therefore, it would have obvious to modify the breathing apparatus of Mucha to include an analysis of ambient gas to determine if the ambient gas is breathable because it would have prevented a user from breathing toxic gases by notifying the user that the filtering capacity of the filter medium is failing as well as preventing the accumulation of potentially explosive gases as taught by Hubner.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-4, and 6-16 have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Annette F. Dixon whose telephone number is (571) 272-3392. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Justine Yu can be reached on (571) 272-4835. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/675,135 Page 8

Art Unit: 3771

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Annette F Dixon

Examiner
Art Unit 3771

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3700

8/29/07